

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the thorough examination of the application that is reflected in the Office Action dated June 20, 2003. To expedite the prosecution of this application, claim 14 is canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, and 12 are amended to correct typographical errors and redundancy in these claims. Claims 1 and 7-11 are amended to change the terms "specified" and "minimum" to "predetermined." New claims 27-33 are added to recite additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Claims 1-13 and 21-33 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 1 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and claims 3-6 and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because of their dependency from claims 1 and 7-11.

With respect to claim 1 the Examiner asserts that the limitation a specified separation is unclear. To expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant amends claim 1 to require "a first wiring ... disposed with a separation from the contact section shorter than a predetermined separation." Thus, claim 1 requires that the first wiring is separated from the contact section by "a predetermined separation." Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 7-11, the Examiner asserts that the limitation "a minimum inter-wiring separation" is unclear. To expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends claim 7 to require "a first wiring ... disposed with a predetermined inter-wiring separation with respect to the contact section." Thus,

claim 7 specifies that the first wiring and the contact section are separated by a "predetermined inter-wiring separation." Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 12-14, 21-23 and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either USPN 5,616,961 to Kohyama (hereinafter "the Kohyama patent") or USPN 5,783,864 to Dawson et al. (hereinafter "the Dawson patent"), and claims 1-14 and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,166,441 to Geryk (hereinafter "the Geryk patent").

Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the recitations of independent claims 1, 21 and 32. The cited references all fail to teach or suggest, for example, that "the extension section does not extend from a side of the connection region facing the first wiring," as required by each of the independent claims.

As shown, for example, in FIG. 1 of the Kohyama patent, the extension section of the connection region is disposed on the side of the connection region that faces the first wiring layer 106-2. As shown in FIG. 1 of the Dawson patent, the extension section of the connection region is disposed on the side of the connection region that faces the first wiring layer 12b. As shown in FIGS. 4 and 5 of the Geryk patent, the extension section of the connection region is disposed on every side of the connection region including the side of the connection region that faces the first wiring layer 540. Thus, the "extension section" in each of the Kohyama, Dawson

and Geryk patents does not "extend from a side of the connection region facing the first wiring," as required by each of the independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant therefore respectfully submits that each of independent claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 are patentable over the cited references. Applicant also submits that dependent claims 2-6, 27; 21-24, 28; 25-26, 29; 30; 31; and 13, 32, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, respectively. In addition, Applicant submits that many of the dependent claims are separately patentable since those claims recite other limitations that are not taught or suggested by the cited references. For example, dependent claims 3, 22 and 26 require that "the connection region is square in its plan configuration." Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest this limitation.

New Dependent Claims

New dependent claims 27-33 are added by this amendment. Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the limitations of these claims that require "the connection region has a first side and a second side that faces the first wiring, and wherein the extension section is disposed on at least the first side of the connection region and is not disposed on the second side." Accordingly, these claims are separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6742 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Application No. 09/754,818
Amdt. Dated October 20, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 81754.0048

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: October 20, 2003

By: 

Anthony J. Orler
Registration No. 41,232
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701